## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-26 were originally submitted.

Claims 17 and 23 are amended.

No claims are cancelled.

Claims 1-26 remain in this application.

### 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,604,847 to Dennis et al (Dennis). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dennis describes determining a band size for a particular page and storing the data file which describes the entire printed page. The stored data file is read and transformed into a set of bandable primitives that corresponds to the entire particular page and a sequence that reflects the desired drawing order of objects on the particular page. The system described in Dennis then divides the bandable primitives at the predetermined band boundaries to create a set of primitives for each band. A band generator converts each banded set of primitives into a band of printer data corresponding to the predetermined band size and stores the band of printer data within a buffer. The method of Dennis describes reading a stored data file that is associated with an printed page and transforming the stored data file into a set of bandable primitives. The primitives are divided into bands corresponding to a predetermined band size. The method involves reading the first set of banded primitives and converting the banded primitives into a

corresponding band of bit-map data. The bit-map data is temporarily stored in a buffer and printed. The steps are repeated for the remaining bands of data. (Dennis, col. 2 lines 37-59).

**Independent claim 1** recites "[a] method for real-time printing comprising:

during generation of a document, continually converting new document information into a fractional print job;

sending each fractional print job to a printer; and

rendering each fractional print job as a raster data package.

The Action argues that "[r]egarding claim 1, Dennis teaches a method for real-time printing comprising: During generation of a document, continually converting new document information into a fractional print job (Dennis, col 3, ln 42-51, during generation of document, document is converted into bandable primitives, i.e. fractional print jobs)".

The cited section of Dennis is as follows:

The data that is to be printed is stored within the host computer system in a format that may generically be called page description language (PDL). PDL is well known to those skilled in the art and will not be described herein. The PDL format describes the entire page in a single file called a metafile. The host computer system of the present invention processes the metafile and converts all objects into bandable primitives. In the presently preferred embodiment, the host computer system processes the metafile only one time to create a set of bandable primitives for the entire page.

Dennis specifically shows that the page or document that is generated is first determined in order to determine a band size for the page or document, then creating and storing data file describing the page or document. The cited section of Dennis particularly describes that a metafile is created, which describes the

entire page or document. Claim 1 specifically recites "during generation of a document, continually converting new document information into a fractional print job". Dennis shows that the page or document is first generated or created. Only when the page or document is created, can the page or document be broken up into bandable primitives. Therefore, the description of Dennis does not allow the ability for "continually converting new document information into a fractional print job".

Dennis does not show or teach each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 2, 6, 8 and 9** depend on claim 1, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 2, 6, 8 and 9 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 10** recites "during generation of a document, continually converting new document information into a fractional print job". The Action presents the same arguments as to claim 1 in rejecting claim 10. As discussed above, Dennis does not allow the ability for "continually converting new document information into a fractional print job".

Dennis does not show or teach each and every element of claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 13, 15 and 16** depend on claim 10, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 10. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 13, 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 17** has been amended and recites "receiving fractional print jobs during generation of a document". As discussed above, Dennis describes determining a page or document first, creating a data file or metafile that describes the page or document, and then creating bandable primitives from the data file or metafile. Only after the page or document is generated or created, and a data file or metafile is created, can the bandable primitives be sent. Therefore, Dennis does not show or teach the element of "receiving fractional print jobs during generation of document" as recited by claim 17.

Dennis does not show or teach each and every element of claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

## 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3-5, 7, 11, 12, 14, and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dennis and of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,089 to Lahey et al (Lahey). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent claims 3-5 and 7** depend from claim 1 and therefore include the element "during generation of a document, continually converting new document information into a fractional print job". The Action argues that Dennis teaches this element; however, as discussed above in support of claim 1, Dennis fails to teach "continually converting new document information into a fractional print job".

The Action relies on Lahey for various teachings as to raster pages in rejecting claims 3-5 and 7; however, Dennis does not teach the elements of claim 1, from which claims 3-5 and 7 depend. Therefore, Lahey provides no assistance

in light of Dennis as to claims 3-5 and 7. Since Dennis does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Lahey do not help. Accordingly, a combination of Dennis and Lahey is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 3-5 and 7 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 11, 12 and 14** depend from claim 10 and therefore include the element "during generation of a document, continually converting new document information into a fractional print job". The Action argues that Dennis teaches this element; however, as discussed above in support of claim 10, Dennis fails to teach "continually converting new document information into a fractional print job".

The Action relies on Lahey for various teachings as to raster pages in rejecting claims 11, 12 and 14; however, Dennis does not teach the elements of claim 10, from which claims 11, 12 and 14 depend. Therefore, Lahey provides no assistance in light of Dennis as to claims 11, 12 and 14. Since Dennis does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Lahey do not help. Accordingly, a combination of Dennis and Lahey is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 11, 12 and 14 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 18-22** depend from claim 17 and therefore include the element "receiving fractional print jobs during generation of document". Dennis teaches determining a page or document first, creating a data file or metafile that describes the page or document, and then creating bandable primitives from the data file or metafile. Only after the page or document is generated or created, and a data file or metafile is created, can the bandable primitives be sent. Therefore, Dennis does not teach or suggest the element of "receiving fractional print jobs during generation of document".

The Action relies on Lahey for various teachings as to raster pages in rejecting claims 18-22; however, Dennis does not teach the element of "receiving fractional print jobs during generation of document" as included in claims 18-22. Therefore, Lahey provides no assistance in light of Dennis as to claims 18-22. Since Dennis does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Lahey do not help. Accordingly, a combination of Dennis and Lahey is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 18-22 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 23** has been amended and recites "a collection module executable on the processor to receive fractional print jobs during generation of a document". As discussed, Dennis teaches determining a page or document first, creating a data file or metafile that describes the page or document, and then creating bandable primitives from the data file or metafile. Only after the page or document is generated or created, and a data file or metafile is created, can the bandable primitives be sent. Therefore, Dennis does not show or teach the element of "a collection module executable on the processor to receive fractional print jobs during generation of a document" as recited by claim 23.

The Action relies on Lahey for teaching "store raster data packages as raster pages in the memory, each raster page comprising one or more raster data packages (Lahey, col 3, In 35-39, wherein the fractional raster data packages which comprise the complete print job are stored as raster page image files in a document database)"; however, Dennis does not teach the element of "a collection module executable on the processor to receive fractional print jobs during generation of a document" as recited by claim 23. Therefore, Lahey provides no assistance in light of Dennis as to claim 23. Since Dennis does not teach the

elements discussed above, the teaching of Lahey do not help. Accordingly, a combination of Dennis and Lahey is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 24** recites "a real-time driver configured to convert document information into fractional print jobs during generation of the document and send the fractional print jobs to a printer". As discussed, Dennis teaches determining a page or document first, creating a data file or metafile that describes the page or document, and then creating bandable primitives from the data file or metafile. Only after the page or document is generated or created, and a data file or metafile is created, can the bandable primitives be sent. Therefore, Dennis does not show or teach the element of "a real-time driver configured to convert document information into fractional print jobs during generation of the document and send the fractional print jobs to a printer" as recited by claim 24.

The Action relies on Lahey for teaching "An application program executable on the processor to generate a document (Lahey, figure 1, editor #11 allows for creation and editing of documents)" however, Dennis does not teach the element of "a real-time driver configured to convert document information into fractional print jobs during generation of the document and send the fractional print jobs to a printer" as recited by claim 24. Therefore, Lahey provides no assistance in light of Dennis as to claim 24. Since Dennis does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Lahey do not help. Accordingly, a combination of Dennis and Lahey is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 24** recites a "computer having a real-time driver, the real-time driver configured to continually convert newly generated document information into a fractional print job and to send each fractional print job to a printing device". As discussed, Dennis teaches determining a page or document first, creating a data file or metafile that describes the page or document, and then creating bandable primitives from the data file or metafile. Only after the page or document is generated or created, and a data file or metafile is created, can the bandable primitives be sent. Therefore, Dennis does not show or teach the element "to continually convert newly generated document information into a fractional print job" as recited by claim 25.

The Action relies on Lahey for teaching "wherein, upon receiving a print instruction from the computer, the printing device immediately begins printing raster data packages (Lahey, col 3, In 35-39, printing commences when print instruction is received)"; however, Dennis does not teach the element of a "computer having a real-time driver, the real-time driver configured to continually convert newly generated document information into a fractional print job and to send each fractional print job to a printing device" as recited by claim 25. Therefore, Lahey provides no assistance in light of Dennis as to claim 25. Since Dennis does not teach the elements discussed above, the teaching of Lahey do not help. Accordingly, a combination of Dennis and Lahey is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

**Dependent claim 26** depends on claim 25, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on base claim 25. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _10/4/05_     By: _____

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256